

## **REMARKS**

The above amendments and the following remarks are fully and completely responsive to the Office Action dated December 13, 2004. Claims 1 and 4-8 are pending in this application. By this Amendment claims 2 and 3 have been canceled and claims 1 and 8 have been amended. In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1 and 4-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claim 3 was indicated as containing allowable subject matter but was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. No new matter has been added. Claims 1 and 4-8 are presented for reconsideration.

### **35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1 and 4-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Locke et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,528,663). Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to include the limitations of claims 2 and 3. Claim 3, which depended from claim 2, was indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 8 should be allowed. Since claims 4-7 depend from claim 1, Applicant submits that these claims should also be allowed. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 4-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

### **35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Locke in view of Richards (U.S. Patent No. 4,042,789). Claim 2 has been canceled, rendering this rejection moot.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claim 3 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The limitations of claim 3 have been incorporated into claims 1 and 8 and claim 3 has been canceled, rendering this objection moot.

### **Conclusion**

Applicant's amendments and remarks have overcome the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action dated December 13, 2004. Specifically, Applicant's amendments to claims 1 and 8 and remarks have distinguished claims 1 and 4-8 from Locke et al. and thus, overcome the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S. C. § 102(b). The cancellation of claim 2 renders moot the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The cancellation of claim 3 renders moot the objection to this claim. Accordingly, claims 1 and 4-8 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 4-8.

Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully

requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney by telephone if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

In the event that this paper is not considered to be timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge payment for any additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300, making reference to attorney docket number 107337-00011.

Respectfully submitted,  
ARENT FOX PLLC



---

Rustan J. Hill  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 37,351

Customer No. 004372  
ARENT FOX PLLC  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,  
Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339  
Tel: (202) 857-6000  
Fax: (202) 638-4810

RJH/elz  
288747\_1.DOC